




# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

JFW



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,706	10/30/2001	Mark D. Seaman	10008306-1	2769

7590 12/20/2006  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ROSARIO, DENNIS	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/20/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/002,706	SEAMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dennis Rosario	2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4,5,7-18 and 27 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 4,5,7-18 and 27 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment was received on 10/23/2006. Claims 4,5,7-18 and 27 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments on page 6,section I, filed 10/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Since upon further review of the specification, the last limitation according to claim 4 is not supported in the specification according to one of ordinary skill in the art. See 112 rejection below for an explanation.

3. Applicant's arguments on page 7, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph filed 10/23/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and states:

"Nowhere does Fuller state that such analysis is used to determine a location at which the image was captured."

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees since Fuller et al. (US Patent 6,877,134 B1) teaches a location (or "global positioning satellite (GPS) data" in col. 9, line 64 which is a function of "latitude and longitude" in col. 9, line 65 which is another form of location) at which the image was captured.

Upon further review of the specification, the last limitation according to claim 4 is not supported in the specification according to one of ordinary skill in the art. See 112 rejection below for an explanation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 4,5,7-18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 4 has the limitation of:

"image meta-data associated with the digital image data created by applying a predefined image analysis algorithm to the digital image data to identify within the image a recognized location at which the image was captured."

This limitation appears to correspond with page 10, last paragraph to page 11, line 14. A pertinent part corresponding to the above limitation states:

"It should also be appreciated that new image file 406 may be used to store other types of information about image data 402, which need not (**emphasis added**) be extracted by a predefined image analysis algorithm 216. For example, image meta-data 404 may also include...information about the location where image 110 was captured. These types of information may be manually input by a user...and stored as image meta-data 404..."

Thus, given this statement from the specification a user and not the claimed predefined image analysis algorithm create meta-data associated with location.

How is the predefined image analysis program applied to the digital image to create said recognized location meta-data when the predefined image analysis program need not be used according to one of ordinary skill in the art? From the examiner's understanding a user, not the predefined image analysis algorithm, creates the claimed image meta-data to identify via a search/query within the image a recognized location at which the image was captured.

Additionally, Fuller et al. teaches that metadata corresponding to said GPS is "defin[ed]/creat[ed]...by a user" in col. 9, line 49. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art will assume a user and not the claimed predefined image analysis algorithm generally create that metadata associated with location.

Claim 7,13 and 16 are rejected for similar reasons as claim 4. All dependent claims are rejected for depending upon a rejected base claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (US Patent 6,035,055 A).

Regarding claim 4, Wang et al. discloses an image file embodied in a computer-readable medium, comprising:

- a) digital image data (fig. 3,num. 130,131,132,103) that represents an image; and
- b) image meta-data (fig. 2, num. 71a) associated with the digital image data created by applying a predefined image analysis algorithm (fig. 3,num. 102) to the digital image data to identify within the image a recognized location (fig. 5,num. 302) at which the image was captured (this portion of the limitation is not given patentable weight due to no support in the specification).

Regarding claim 5, Wang et al. discloses the image file of claim 4, wherein the image meta-data comprises at least one searchable keyword ("text description" in col. 7, line 52).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4,7-15 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. (US Patent 6,877,134 B1) in view of Wang et al. (US Patent 6,035,055 A).

Regarding claim 7, Fuller et al. teaches an image capture device, comprising:

- a) image capture hardware configured to capture an image ("camera" in col., line 6., line 46.); and
- b) logic configured for:
  - b1) generating a digital representation of the image (fig. 19,num. 1203 outputs or generates the image.), the digital representation comprising image data;
  - b2) applying at least one predefined image analysis algorithm ("video engine" in col. 4, line 17 performs a "visual analysis" in col. 4, line 15) to the digital representation of the image to identify within the image a recognized location at which the image was captured (this portion of the limitation is not given patentable weight due to no support in the specification),
    - b21) the at least one predefined image analysis algorithm generating image meta-data ("generates metadata" in col. 4, lines 18,19) corresponding to the recognized location; and

b3) combining (Fig. 19,num. 1700) the image meta-data corresponding to the recognized location with the image data (via num. 1207) to define new image data (Fig. 19,num. 1700 is a new image data or "Combined" in fig. 19,num. 1700 image data.).

Fuller et al. does not teach the claimed recognized location, but teaches that metadata can be "generated" in col. 3, line 62 from "Face identification/recognition" in col. 4, line 4. Thus, Fuller et al. suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to use face identification because Fuller et al. does not provide a detailed teaching of face identification in order to generate metadata.

Wang et al. teaches face identification as shown in fig. 4,num. 201 as suggested by Fuller et al. and the claimed recognized location in fig. 5,num. 302 in order to generate metadata or "extract content data" in col. 2, lines 24,25.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fuller et al.'s teaching of face identification with Wang et al.'s teaching of face identification, because Wang et al.'s teaching of face identification "automatically extracts and stores content data of digital images such that effective and efficient search and retrieval of the digital images can be achieved" in col. 2, lines 16-19.

Claim 4 is rejected the same as claim 7. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 7 of a device is equally applicable to claim 4 of a file.

Regarding claim 8, Fuller et al. teaches the image capture device of claim 7, wherein the logic is software ("software" in the abstract) and further comprising a processing device ("mechanisms" in the abstract.) for implementing the logic.

Regarding claim 9, Fuller et al. teaches the image capture device of claim 7, wherein the logic is further configured for storing the new image data (Fig. 19, num. 1700).

Regarding claim 10, Fuller et al. teaches the image capture device of claim 7, further comprising:

a) a network interface device (Fig. 1,num. 150) configured for communication with a communications network (Fig. 1 all numerals except num. 150) and wherein the logic is further configured for:

a1) providing the new image data to the communications network (via servers of fig. 1,num. 130 and 140).

Claim 11 is rejected the same as claim 10. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 10 is equally applicable to claim 11.

Claim 12 is rejected the same as claim 5. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 5 is equally applicable to claim 12.

Claim 13 is rejected the same as claim 7. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 7 is equally applicable to claim 13 except for the limitation of:

a) identifying a digital representation of an image ("Keyframes" in col. 7, line 17 are "extracted" in col. 7, line 17), the digital representation comprising image data.

Claim 14 is rejected the same as claim 5. Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 5 is equally applicable to claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, Fuller et al. discloses the method of claim 13, wherein identifying a digital representation of the image involves receiving ("during [a] capture process" in col. 7, line 17) the image data.

Regarding claim 27, Fuller discloses the image capture device of claim 7, wherein the image capture device is a digital camera.

Note that the claimed "digital camera" is not given patentable weight since the claimed "digital camera" is part of the preamble of claim 7 and does not perform an active function or included in a function with respect to the body of claim 7. The body of claim 7 does not need the claimed "digital camera" in order to perform the method of claim 7 or the body of claim 7 is understood without the claimed "digital camera".

10. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuller et al. (US Patent 6,877,134 B1) in view of Wang et al. (US Patent 6,035,055 A) and further in view of Li et al. (US Patent 5,734,893 A).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Fuller et al. and Wang et al. teaches the claimed image meta-data having been generated by applying a predefined image analysis algorithm to the digital representation of the image to identify a recognized location within the image as addressed in claim 7, above.

Fuller et al. of the combination does not teach the remaining limitations of claim 16, but does teach that meta-data can be used for a "search" in col. 4, line 20. However, Fuller et al. does not appear to teach a method of searching with meta-data and is focused on a "browse" in col. 4, line 21 operation. Since Fuller et al. does not provide a method of searching, Fuller et al. suggests a method of searching with meta-data.

Li et al. teaches a method of searching with meta-data as shown in fig. 2 and the remaining limitations of claim 16 of:

- a) receiving a search query (Fig. 2,num. 202 receives a search query via fig. 2,num. 201) comprising information related to specific image meta-data;
- b) based on the search query, searching one or more image files (fig. 1,num. 105) for the image meta-data specified in the search query; and
- c) identifying (Fig. 2, num. 204 matches which is a form of identifying.) one or more of the image files that comprise image meta-data that matches the image meta-data specified in the search query.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Fuller et al.'s meta-data with the search method of Li et al., because Li et al.'s search method "assist[s] the user...regarding...the...query (Li et al., col. 3, lines 15-17)."

Claim 17 is rejected the same as claim 16c). Thus, argument similar to that presented above for claim 17 is equally applicable to claim 16c.

Regarding claim 18, Li et al. of the combination teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the image meta-data and the search query comprises at least one searchable keywords ("keywords" in col. 1, line 30).

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Taniguchi et al. (US Patent 6,757,693 B2) is pertinent as teaching a method of using meta-data with "Recording Position" as shown n fig. 6.

Rhodes et al. (US Patent 6,236,768 B1) is pertinent as teaching a method of "meta-information...indicating the geographic location" in col. 11, lines 41,42.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Rosario whose telephone number is (571) 272-7397. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DR

Dennis Rosario  
Unit 2624

  
DANIEL MIRIAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

<b>Notice of References Cited</b>	Application/Control No. 10/002,706	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination SEAMAN ET AL.
	Examiner Dennis Rosario	Art Unit 2624

**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-6,757,693 B2	06-2004	Taniguchi et al.	707/104.1
*	B	US-6,236,768 B1	05-2001	Rhodes et al.	382/306
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

**FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

**NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)  
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

Organization 102041 Bidg/Room KINOK  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

If Undeliverable Return in Ten Days

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE U.S. OFFICIAL  
PENALTY  
PRIVATE USE  
ATTORNEY MAIL  
02-11  
0034204479  
DEC 20  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 2  
**\$ 01.**

*Returned for better address*

